

COLLABORATIVE WRITING TECNIQUE EFFECT ON THE STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Desi Afifah

English Language Teaching Study Program
Postgraduate School, University of Islam Malang, Indonesia
Email: afifahdesi28@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of the research is to know the significant effect of collaborative writing about the achievement of students' writing recount text. This research was conducted to investigate the significant effect of CWT on the students' achievement in writing recount text is effective. The hypothesis is there is significant effect of CWT on students' achievement in writing recount text. This research is an experimental study and uses quasi experimental research design. The research subject is the students of one of second grade of state junior high school in Karangploso. This study used two groups of students, experimental and control group. Testing writing composition was used as the data collection technique and t-Test calculated by SPSS Statistic 20 was used as the data analyze technique to discover the difference between students' pretest and posttest score of control and experimental group. The significant (2-tailed) score of posttest control and experimental group is lower than 0.05 % that is 0,001. It indicates that the result of posttest of experimental and control group were different. Then, that CWT in teaching writing of recount text is effective as the hypothesis is accepted.

Keywords: Effectiveness, Collaborative writing, Writing Achievement.

INTRODUCTION

Studying English nowadays is more important since it has been used in many aspects. Four skills of English (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) have their own difficulties but writing becomes one of skills which should get more attention. Gebhard (2000: 235) assertions three basic problems that is faced by the teacher in teaching writing. Those are: 1) Problem in teaching , that is the problem of the incompetent writer", 2) problem "I am not able to write English", and 3) problem "teacher reaction". Gebhard (2000: 221) said also that writing is commonly correlated with word choice, using appropriate grammar, mechanics (spelling, punctuation, and hand writing), syntax (word order), and organization of ideas into a form which is cohesive and coherent. The teacher in teaching writing can select one of techniques, as like collaborative writing (CW). Many research shows that CW might significantly improve students' writing performance.

The research that is linked with CW that was done by Bakar, Challob, and Latif (2016) on the tittle "Collaborative Blended Learning Writing Environment: Effects on EFL Students' Writing Apprehension and Writing Performance" this study was held in one of the Malaysia international schools. It discovered that the students experienced the collaborative blended learning writing environment (CBLWE) and they had positive perceptions for CBLWE. They felt, their writing apprehension had reduced, CBLWE had improved their writing performance, and they experienced and learned more knowledge concerning the micro and macro aspects of writing by using

CBLWE. Students also noticed that they had been assisted greatly in their task of writing by their collaboration and online discussion on writing in Viber groups and the class blog.

A research about collaborative writing which was done by Mulyani (2014) with the title "The Effect of Using Collaborative Writing Approach toward Students' Writing Ability on Narrative Paragraphs at State Junior High School 2 Kampar" indicates that CW approach significantly effected ability in writing on narrative paragraphs at the nine grade students of "State Junior High School 2 Kampar."

In line with discussion other researcher related with CW done by Luna and Ortiz (2013) in the study under the title "Collaborative Writing to Enhance Academic Writing Development through Project Work" indicated that almost all students were excited to work, they also enjoyed writing collaboratively. Because of it, they could help each other and establish meaningful negotiation. Nevertheless, students struggled to get agreement on certain aspects such as the connector or the suitable word to espouse their views as was demonstrated ahead in the sub-category From Difference to Agreement and understanding how to write an essay.

The research about CW which was done by Ghufrron and Hawa (2015) with the title "The Effect of Collaborative Writing Technique in Teaching Argumentative Essay Writing Viewed from The Students' Creativity" this research is an experimental research. The research was carried out in IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro in the academic year of 2014/2015 from March 2015 to June 2015 indicates that in teaching writing, CW techniques is more effective than direct instruction, low creativity students do not have better writing ability than the students who have high creativity, and between teaching techniques and creativity in teaching writing, interaction is found.

Furthermore, the research related with CWT that done by Soraya (2016) with the title "The Effectiveness of Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) in Writing Lesson Regarded to The Students' Creativity" also found that CWS is effective in writing; the low creativity students did not produced better writing rather than the high creativity student; and the interaction of teaching methods and the students' creativity is existing in this writing lesson.

Based on the research before, the conclusion is that CW bestows some benefits to the students such as help the students to write, increase the students' motivation, provides students' critical thinking, improve the students' creativity, reduce students' writing apprehension, and improve students' writing performance.

Then researcher took the conclusion the difference and similarity between this research and those previous studies. The similarity is it uses the same method (CWT). It also used quantitative research, but only in the previous study with the tittle "CBLW: effects on EFL students' writing apprehension and writing performance" that was used qualitative case study. Meanwhile, the differences of those previous studies and this research are the material used in the research. The previous study used narrative text, argumentative essay, writing lesson, and also project work while this study uses recount text.

This research presents the result of students' writing achievement which uses CW technique. This research can be developed for further research to solve the writing problems happen in the classroom. It can be a hint to make new effective writing technique, throwback to the writing teaching techniques which were sometimes ineffective and bored. The readers can choose whether to ignore or use collaborative writing after this research is done. Finally, learners can select the best way to learn writing, in order to get good writing performance.

METHOD

This experimental research was applied on the second grade of one of state junior high schools in Karangploso to know the effectiveness of collaborative writing technique (CWT) on students' writing achievement in recount text. There were two groups which became sample in this research. Where, one is called the experimental group (ExG), while another is the control group (CoG). Both of groups got a pre-test and a post-test. Only the ExG obtained the treatment by using CWT, meanwhile the CoG used conventional teaching technique (CTT). However, the material was taught to each group is recount text. In the last of the research, the researcher compared the result of the research to know the effect of CWT. The quasi-experimental design is illustrated as follow:

Table 1 – Pre-Test & Post- Test Design of Non Randomized Experimental & Control Group

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
ExG	Y ₁	X ₁	Y ₂
CoG	Y ₁	X ₂	Y ₂

Y₁ = Pretest

Y₂ = Posttest

X₁ = Collaborative Writing Technique (CWT)

X₂ = Conventional Teaching (CT)

The second grade of one of state junior high schools in Karangploso is as this research population. Why the researcher chose this population because the students invented that the most difficult skill to learn is writing, they made many errors in grammatical. Because they had low vocabulary mastery, some of them still used Indonesian language in their writing, and the students' writing ability is also still low; the researcher intended a way to increase students' writing achievement. One of the ways to increase the students' writing achievement is recount text by using CWT. 2 classes was used as the sample, 8A was as ExG that consists of 30 students and 8B was as the CoG that consists of 28 students.

The procedure of collecting data in this study was given pre-test and post-test to the students as respondents to measure students' writing achievement. There were some steps which were used to catch the data.

The first was asking permission letter from the campus. After the head master had given the permission, researcher collected the data by giving pre-test (it was done to make sure that students' average score is not significantly different) before treatment to both of groups and post-test after being taught by using CWT for the ExG and CTT for the CoG. The test was making a recount text about one of the following themes; best friend, birthday, and hobby.

Furthermore, the treatment was for about four times to ExG and CoG by teaching recount text. As a stated by Speck (2002) the implementation CWT process in the treatment was 1) the teacher requested the students to write recount text by giving the theme, 2) the teacher divided the students become 10 groups and each group consists of 3 students, 3) the students discussed about the roles of group members, such as who would be a writer, who would make the orientation, event, and the reorientation. In this step they also have to discuss about the ideas or the topic of the text that they would make, 4) Group member work individually to prepare the draft of assigned, 5) group members read and commented the draft that was made individually. Based on those comments, a subgroup would revise its draft, this process would continue until the group puts the entire document together, 6) group continue to check the grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and spelling, 7) the draft was reviewed by another group, 8) the group revises based on view of the another group, 9) each group collected the draft to the teacher.

Next is documenting the scores of the post-test in worksheet writing test about recount text. The last is making conclusion by interpreting the result of statistical analysis. SPSS version 20 was used to compute and analyze the data.

Pre-test and post-test were the instrument of this research. Measuring the students' writing through score before and after the treatment given the tests was given. Students were asked to make recount text. The aim of conducting the pre-test is to see the level of the students writing achievement before the treatment given. And the post test is to see the effect of CWT on the students writing achievement.

The test was constructed based on the curriculum 2006 for junior high school and the instrument adopted from English in Focus for Grade 8 Junior High School in getting the criterion of content validity. Then, the researcher used it as research instrument.

The reliability of the instrument was Inter Rater reliability. Analyzing and calculating the scores using SPSS 20 application were done in order to know the reliable of the test through the scores which was scored by rater 1 and rater 2. Then the result will be gotten. Here is the output table:

Table 2 – Statistic of Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,774	2

According to Pallant (2001;99) if cronbach's alpha above 0.7, so the scale can be considered reliable with our sample. It is clearly seen from the table 2 that value of the reliability is 0.774. It means that the test was reliable.

To compare the means of two independent classes, independent sample t-test was used. The procedures for data analysis technique were:

1. Document needed for the document collected was given the check sign in the list.

Table 3 – Document Check Sign in the List

NO	Document	Collected	Not Collected
1	Lesson Plan	√	
2	Syllabus	√	

2. Step which was done to analyze the test was interpreting and counting posttest and pretest students' score. It was according to scoring rubric of writing adapted from Hughes (2003:104).

3. To find out t-value, the t-test formula was used. In analyzing, the data gained from the test, the writer did the certain steps using the t-test. First, measuring the pretest and posttest results, second, the researcher analyzed them by using formula of t-test in SPSS 20 program after knowing the mean scores of pretest and posttest, the researcher found out the significant difference between pretest and posttest and the mean score the test tabulated into pretest and posttest to differentiate the result before treatment and after treatment.

RESULTS

By using SPSS 20 program, the researcher analyzed the data by using independent t-test with the critical value of $< .05$.

Table 4 – Score of Pre-Test in Independent t-Test Analysis

Group Statistics				
Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest Score Experimental Group	30	55,5667	9,67999	1,76732
Control Group	28	59,5357	6,97871	1,31885

Independent Samples Test									
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
Pretest Score	Equal variances assumed	1,793	,186	-1,780	56	,080	-3,96905	2,22976	-8,43580 ,49770
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,800	52,729	,078	-3,96905	2,20517	-8,39259 ,45450

Table 4 shows the pre-test analysis for the CoG and ExG. The data was calculated with independent t-test, the mean of CoG (59.53) is higher than the mean of ExG (55.56). There was significant difference between the data of mean score of ExG and CoG. The score of standard deviation (Std) of ExG is 9.67 and the Std of CoG is 6.97. The Std of data CoG is lower than ExG. The mean of standard error (Ste) of ExG is 1.76 and the mean of Ste of CoG is 1.31. The Std of data CoG is lower than ExG. When the data calculated with independent t-test, the score of F of equal variances (EV) assumed is 1.79. The score of Significant is 0,186 > 0.05 . The means score t test equality is -1.780. The df for means score equality is 56. And significant (2-tailed) score is 0,080 which is lower than 0.5 (2-tailed). From that analyzed, by the comparison of pretest result there was significant difference that was showed.

Table 5 - Posttest Score in Independent t-Test Analysis

Group Statistics				
Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Posttest Score Experimental Group	30	69,0000	8,89828	1,25945
Control Group	28	62,7857	6,11832	1,15625

Independent Samples Test									
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
Posttest Score	Equal variances assumed	,020	,887	3,619	56	,001	6,21429	1,71690	2,77493 9,65364
	Equal variances not assumed			3,635	55,863	,001	6,21429	1,70972	2,78913 9,63945

Table 5 gives the illustration about the analysis of the CoG and ExG. The data of ExG at post-test showed that the mean score of ExG is 69.00 and the mean score post-test of the CoG is 62.78 those were before the data calculated with independent t-test. The data of mean score is ExG post-test is higher than CoG post-test. The Std of ExG is 6.89 and the Std of post-test CoG is 6.11. The Std of data post-test of ExG is higher than CoG. The Ste mean post-test of ExG is 1.25 and 1.15 is the CoG mean of Ste. When the data calculated with independent t-test, the F score of EV assumed is 0,020. The score of Significant of EV is 0,887. The score of t EV is 3.61. The score of df equality of variance is 56. And the score of significant (2-tailed) is 0,001 which is lower than 0.05 (two-tailed). The result of the computation of the total scores of the students indicated that the p-value was 0.001, which was lower than 0.05 (two-tailed). It indicated that the post test result of ExG and CoG were different. The tables showed that the total score which was gotten by the students of CoG was significant difference from the ExG. It can be concluded that CWT is effective.

The purpose of this study is to investigate that CWT is able to be effective technique in teaching writing of recount text. The ExG was taught writing by using CWT and CoG was taught writing by using CTT. In order the null hypothesis of this study was that the students who are taught by CWT do not achieve better than those who are taught by CTT. To know if the null hypothesis was accepted or rejected, the researcher compute the comparison of score, the researcher set the level at the 0.05 and compared it with p-value. The interpretation was if the probability is more than .05; H0 is accepted and if the probability is less than .05; H1 is accepted.

The finding showed that the null hypothesis is rejected. Whereas, the alternative hypothesis which was formulated there is significant effect of CWT on students' achievement in writing recount text is accepted. This indicated that the difference of the two means was significant. It can be decided that CWT is effective to teach recount text.

DISCUSSION

Writing activity is a skill to express ideas or opinions in the writing form and produced in the text form. In term of writing, the students are estimated to enhance their skills in rhetorical structures and expressing meaning through simple texts using written language varieties appropriately, correctly, and fluently to interact with others in daily life context. The main objective of this study was to measure the effectiveness of collaborative writing technique to improve the students' writing skill in recount text. CWT is a good and appropriate technique to teach writing. It is crucial in the students' whole writing process. Here, the researcher used CWT to enhance the students' writing skill. There is significant effect of CWT on students' achievement in writing recount text is the hypothesis of this study. The researcher assumed that CWT can give good effect to the students' writing. The students can corporate to write a good text. The students can share the idea together with other students and make a good text by using this technique.

The result presented that CWT has given significant effect to the students' writing achievement. This result can be seen from ExG pretest and posttest score. The students' score improve after using CWT; from the result of the data analysis, it is seen. The researcher used this technique when the researcher taught the students. After using this technique, the writing skill is achieved. The pre-test and post test scores showed that CWT is effective than CTT. Many researchers said that CWT was effective.

These studies have focused on the research on finding the effectiveness of CWT. Mentioning to the reason in the previous chapter, the hypothesis was agreed. Then in enhancing the students' writing quality, the CWT is effective. Here, the data that got from the students' writing skill is described by the researcher. The hypothesis (Ha) beneath the investigation which states CWT effects significantly on the second grade students' recount text was accepted.

The students of the second grade of one of the state junior high school have experienced about English. It is important to the English teacher to make the students are successful in mastering English especially writing. Some errors are often happened in writing and students often get confused in stating their idea into word to be written. To overcome the problems, it is very crucial to find a better technique in teaching English. Therefore, to make them work together in a group so they can share their idea, the CWT was used to teach the students. And it is very helpful. In the form of recount text, it appears to reduce the students' error in making some sentences. The research was done on the students of one of the state junior high school in Karangploso. .

The conclusion of the research is CWT is accepted. A positive effect on students' writing was given by CWT, especially in recount text. According to many theories in CWT, the students can have good writing achievement. In addition, the students have good ability in learning writing.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research finding, it is concluded that CWT gives a good effect in teaching writing of recount text. Then, CWT is effective technique writing especially in recount text.

In fact, the students can share the idea and write it well and remind each other about the errors. CWT has significant part in improving the students writing skill. This current research hopefully can give contribution to the others. Then, to obtain the benefit, some suggestions are recommended to the teachers and further researchers who want to teach writing concerning CWT. For the teachers, the researcher hopes the teacher can apply CWT

as the technique to overcome the students' difficulties learning English, especially in writing. And the researcher hopes the teacher can develop this technique to make the students more interested. Then, the student can improve their writing skill. For the further researchers, this research can be useful for other researchers especially those who will do the research in writing skill. This research hopefully might be good reference to conduct the next research and the researcher also suggests to the next researcher to do the individual score to the student and doing it in a longer time and.

REFERENCES

- Challob, A. I., Bakar, N. A. & Latif, H. 2016. Collaborative Blended Learning Writing Environment: Effects on EFL Students' Writing Apprehension and Writing Performance. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*. 9(6): 229-241.
- Djusma, S.M., Jahur, M. B., & Artono, W. 2008. English in Focus for Grade VIII Junior High School (SMP/MTs). Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Gebhard, J. G. 2000. Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language: A Teacher Self-Development and Methodology Guide. Ann Arbor: The University Michigan Press.
- Hawa, M. & Ghufro, M.A. 2015. The Effect of Collaborative Writing Technique in Teaching Argumentative Essay Writing Viewed from The Students' Creativity. 10(1): 49-60.
- Hughes, A. 2003. Testing for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luna, A. M. R & Ortiz, H. S. L. 2013. Collaborative Writing to Enhance Academic Writing Development through Project Work. *HOW, A Colombian Journal for Teachers of English*. 130-148.
- Mulyani, Fatimah. 2014. The Effect of Using Collaborative Writing Approach toward Students' Writing Ability on Narrative Paragraphs at State Junior High School 2 Kampar. Unpublished thesis. Pekanbaru: Faculty of Education And Teacher Training, State Islamic University Of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau Pekanbaru.
- Pallant, J. 2001. SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to the Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows (Version 10). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Soraya, K. 2016. The Effectiveness of Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) in Writing Lesson Regarded to The Students' Creativity. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(2). 63-67.
- Speck, B. W. 2002. Facilitating Students' Collaborative Writing. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28(6).
- Tinzmann, M. B. 2004. What is The Collaborative Classroom. [on line]. Available: http://www.ncrel.org/sds/rpl_esys/collab-htm-88k- [January 9th, 2004].